

## REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21 are pending. Claims 1, 8 and 15 are amended herein.

### 103 Rejections

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AddressPro v4.0 ("AddressPro"). The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully asserts that AddressPro does not show or suggest the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21.

Applicant understands AddressPro to provide a user interface for changing sort order. However, as presented below, Applicant submits that the user interface of AddressPro is different from that of the present claimed invention.

Embodiments of the present claimed invention provide a user interface mechanism that allows a user to modify the contents of a sort table to alter sort instructions used for sorting records by category. As presented in the claims, a sort table (e.g., element 310 of Figure 7 of the instant application) is accessed to establish the primary sort field and other sort fields selected by a user for each category (e.g., primary sort field 310b, secondary sort field 310c, etc., of Figure 7). The primary sort field and other sort fields are used to produce a first sorted list (e.g., list 410a of Figure 9). Then, for a particular category, a group of sort instructions selected by the user for that category (e.g., group 515 of Figures 13A and 13B) can be displayed to the user. The group of sort instructions includes a listing of sort fields that have been selected by the user (e.g., sort fields 520b, 520c

and 520d of Figures 13A and 13B) for the category and are currently in use. By selecting from the group of sort instructions a sort field selected by the user and hence currently being used (e.g., sort field 520c of Figure 13B), a pop-down list of sort fields (e.g., pop-down list 530 of Figure 13B) is displayed. The pop-down list includes sort fields that can be used to replace the sort field (e.g., sort field 520c) selected by the user and currently being used. The user can then select a sort field from the pop-down list to replace the previously selected sort field. Significantly, the user is first presented with a display of the sort fields currently in use, and the user can then select one of the sort fields currently in use and replace the selected sort field with another sort field from the pop-down list.

Applicant respectfully submits that AddressPro does not show or suggest that the user is presented with a display of sort fields selected by the user for a category and currently in use for that category, as recited in the claims.

Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that AddressPro does not show or suggest "e) displaying on said display screen a group of sort instructions stored in said sort table, wherein displayed are said primary sort field and said other sort fields that have been selected by said user for said first category type; [and] f) receiving an indication from said user that selects a selected one of said primary sort field and said other sort fields that have been selected by said user for said first category type" as recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 15.

In summary, Applicant respectfully submits that AddressPro does not show or suggest the present claimed invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claims 1, 8

and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and that Claims 1, 8 and 15 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, 14, 16-19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations.

### Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Date: 12/22/04

Respectfully submitted,  
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



William A. Zarbis  
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060